
Appendix F-A

Documentation of Additional Investigations

Memo

To: Amy Zlotsky
From: Stacy Stupka-Burda *SSB*
CC: Stan Parks, Bill Callahan, Rob Bozell
Date: 9/19/00
Re: South and East Beltway: Possible Archeological Site on Ron Skoda's property

Amy,

As we discussed in early August 2000, during discussions with Rod Otley, Mr. Otley mentioned that another person living in the SW ¼ of Section 21, T10N, R8E relayed to him that "something" had been found during excavations related to construction activities on this property. Mr. Otley stated that he was told "Indians came out and held a ceremony" after which construction was completed.

While we had no first hand knowledge of the situation we operated under the assumption that there was a possibility that human remains were discovered. Therefore, we felt it was important to try and determine what, if anything had been discovered. As you are undoubtedly aware LB340 and NAGPRA mandate that the discovery of human remains be handled in a very specific manner.

We discussed this situation with Rob Bozell of the Nebraska State Historical Society to determine whether or not his office had ever been notified about the discovery of human remains in the area in question. Mr. Bozell assured us that his office has not been notified of any discovery of human remains in that area.

We also checked with the local Native American community, who indicated that they had no knowledge of anything discovered in the area in question. Furthermore, our contacts indicated members of the local Native American community would handle any situation involving the discovery of human remains in accordance with State and Federal law.

On numerous occasions during fieldwork conducted relative to the South and East Beltway Study, the UNL Department of Anthropology attempted to gain permission to conduct archeological investigations in the area in question. We were repeatedly, and quite firmly denied access.

In summary, it is not clear what, if anything was found on the property described above. It is clear, however, that no local authorities were notified. If human remains were discovered and not reported, it would be violation of both State and Federal Law.

Memo

To: Amy Zlotzky
From: Stacy Stupka-Burda *SSB*
CC: Stan Parks
Date: 10/13/00
Re: Addendum: Archeological Inventory and Testing of Lincoln's South and East Beltway: Alternatives SM-1, EC-1, EM-1, and EF-1 Lancaster County, Nebraska Volumes I and II.

This memo is prepared as an Addendum to the report entitled, Archeological Inventory and Testing of Lincoln's South and East Beltway: Alternatives SM-1, EC-1, EM-1 and EF-1 Lancaster County, Nebraska Volumes I and II, prepared by Stan Parks and Stacy Stupka-Burda of the UNL Department of Anthropology (January 2000).

As a result of public comments received regarding the Preliminary Assessment of Adverse Effects, researchers from the UNL Department of Anthropology investigated three locations which were reported by property owners to be archeological sites not previously recorded during the archeological inventory of the South and East Beltway alternatives conducted in 1996 and 1998 (Parks and Stupka-Burda 2000). Through these additional investigations, two previously unrecorded archeological sites were documented. A fourth locale, reported as a potential archeological site is addressed in a separate memo dated 09/19/2000.

25LC162 (EBAP2000-01)

This site is located in the [REDACTED] Township. Descriptively, this site is located approximately [REDACTED]. Site 25LC162 is a lithic scatter located in an upland setting and is estimated to encompass [REDACTED]. Lithic material types noted included Nehawka chert, white chalcedony, red quartzite and brown chert. A total of 12 flakes were noted on the ground surface, and all of these appeared to be secondary decortication or tertiary flakes. No formal or expedient tools were noted. The property owner indicated that artifacts had been collected from this site, but these artifacts could not be located for examination by UNL researchers. The property owner indicated that they had not collected any projectile points. The site area is under agricultural cultivation, and ground surface visibility in mid-August 2000 was 75-80%. The site is located approximately 300 meters east of the eastern most survey boundary for the [REDACTED] alternative inventoried by UNL in 1998 and occurs outside the project right-of-way.

Given the paucity of artifacts observed on the ground surface, the absence of diagnostic or patterned tools, and the upland setting associated with this site, 25LC162 is recommended not eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). No additional investigation is recommended.

25LC163 (EBAP2000-02)

The site, 25LC163 is located in the [REDACTED] Township. Descriptively, this site is approximately [REDACTED]. 25LC163 is a non-Native American site, commonly referred to as a Euroamerican or historic site. The site area is estimated to cover [REDACTED] and extends from an area currently under agricultural cultivation to an area dominated by scrubby tree growth. Ground surface visibility ranged from 95% in the agricultural field to 15% within the trees. Artifacts noted on the ground surface included red brick, flatglass and stoneware. Within the trees, UNL researchers observed more red brick, tin cans, a barrel stay, automotive body pieces from a ca. 1920 car body, and unidentifiable ferrous metal pieces. The artifacts located in the trees appear to be of secondary deposition, and are either the result of clearing the agricultural field, household refuse disposal, or most probably, some combination thereof. This site is located in an upland setting within the original survey corridor of the [REDACTED] alternative. This area was not inventoried by UNL researchers in 1998 because NeSHPO approved survey design of the archeological inventory of the South and East Beltway alternatives dictated that only 10% of the upland areas were to be surveyed (Parks and Stupka-Burda 2000). This sampling was obtained in upland settings scattered throughout each survey corridor. Inventory of the parcel where site 25LC163 is located was arbitrarily not selected to complete the 10% sample of alternative [REDACTED].

The type of information afforded by site 25LC163 is available in archival sources. Beyond locational information already recorded, the archeological research potential of this site is severely limited. Therefore, this site is recommended not eligible to the NRHP. No additional investigation is recommended.

Additional archeological inventory

UNL also inventoried an area located in the [REDACTED] Township. This location was described as a potential archeological site by the property owner. This area is an upland setting approximately [REDACTED]. The most recent agricultural crop at this locale was wheat. Ground surface visibility was approximately 35%. No artifacts were noted on the ground surface, and no archeological site was recorded.

enclosures:

NSHS site form – 25LC162

NSHS site form – 25LC163

Topographic map illustrating areas surveyed as discussed above

} omit in EIS
for confidentiality

Memo

To: Amy Zlotsky

From: Stacy Stupka-Burda

CC: Stan Parks

Date: 10/17/00

Re: South and East Beltway: Reevaluation of historic properties in response to public comment

This memo was prepared in response to public comments received regarding the Preliminary Assessment of Adverse Effects. Researchers from the UNL Department of Anthropology investigated seven locations reported by property owners to be historic properties potentially eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or archeological sites. In some cases, public comment suggested that these locations were not previously evaluated during investigations conducted by On Site Photography and Preservation (1998) or were not recorded by the archeological inventory of the South and East Beltway alternatives conducted in 1996 and 1998 (Parks and Stupka-Burda 2000). In addition, concerned property owners requested that two locations be reevaluated regarding their potential NRHP eligibility.

UNL Researchers revisited each locale in question and found that the original evaluations and recommendations provided by On Site (1998) were valid. In the case of two properties not included in the On Site report (1998), the Otley Farmstead and the Speidell Barn, UNL determined that these properties did not retain sufficient integrity and did not meet minimum evaluation considerations outlined in the Nebraska Historic Buildings Survey (NeHBS) Manual (July 9, 1997), and were not included in the original inventory conducted by On Site (1998).

The NRHP eligibility of the Hulda Otto House was examined and detailed in Evaluation of the Hulda Otto House for Eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places (Stupka-Burda 1999).

One locale, reported as a potential archeological site, is addressed in a separate memo dated 09/19/2000. Two archeological sites recorded as a result of additional investigation are detailed in a memo dated 10/13/00.

Maahs Barns

Recommendation: Not Eligible.

Numerous modern intrusions are present on this property. There are 5 steel grain bins present, three of which are very large and dwarf the barns. A modern house has been placed on site. There is no integrity of setting, feeling or association remaining at this site.

Otley Farmstead

Recommendation: Not eligible.

The integrity of this structure and the surrounding farmyard is no longer intact. The house lacks integrity, and does not meet minimum evaluation considerations outlined in the Nebraska Historic Buildings Survey (NeHBS) Manual (July 9, 1997). The original porch supports on the house have been replaced with wrought iron supports, and the house has been clad in wide lap siding. At least two additions, one to the north and one to the east, and a new entrance have been added. All of the windows that UNL could see from the public right-of-way have been replaced, and no original molding exists around the windows. The chimney has been removed. The presence of indoor plumbing is not germane to the question of NRHP eligibility. The setting of the yard is intact, but the house retains little integrity.

In the farmyard itself, there is an older corrugated metal building (ca. 1950-60) plus two new metal quonsets. There are two small granaries (which look to be the only intact historic buildings on site, but still are not the best representations of such structures in the study area).

This house and the surrounding farmyard have been substantially altered and cannot be considered eligible to the NRHP. Especially when compared to other eligible properties in the study area.

The Bud and Joan Speidell Barn

Recommendation: Not eligible.

The barn is clad in board and batten siding with decorative scalloping, and the haymow door faces north. While the barn looks intact on the north and west sides from public right-of-way, the integrity of this gable roof barn is not intact. On the east side, the board and batten siding has been replaced with corrugated metal. The lower portion of the board and batten siding has been replaced with corrugated metal on the north side.

In addition, the agricultural setting originally associated with this barn has been significantly altered. The setting is now park like, with bluegrass and many exotic trees planted all around the barn. This barn is not the best representative of such a barn in the study area. Other structures on site are modern.

This property does not meet minimum evaluation considerations outlined in the Nebraska Historic Buildings Survey (NeHBS) Manual (July 9, 1997).

The Want Schoolhouse (LC00:E-101)

Recommendation: Not eligible.

In addition to On Site's comments (Elliott and Dirr 1998), the building sits upon a new poured concrete foundation, one door has been replaced with an insulated steel door, and full-light French patio doors have been added on the south facade. These additions and insertions are not in keeping with the architectural style of the school. A modern house is positioned approximately 12 m (40 ft) west of the schoolhouse, and a trailer park is located approximately 15 m (50 ft) east. The integrity of this structure is no longer intact, and modern intrusions have impacted the integrity of setting and feeling.

Williss Farm (LC00:E-80):

Recommendation: Not eligible.

UNL supports On Site's recommendation, this property is not eligible to the NRHP. On Site (1998) did assess the entire farm, but found that the integrity of the house was compromised and thus did not evaluate it for NRHP eligibility.

The house lacks integrity, and does not meet minimum evaluation considerations outlined in the Nebraska Historic Buildings Survey (NeHBS) Manual (July 9, 1997). Specifically, an addition has been placed on the west, and many windows have been replaced. The house has been resided, and shutters have been added. The entrance over the east door has been replaced and is not in keeping with the architectural style or feel of the house. There is no brick chimney visible, so one can assume that it has been removed. While this house is well maintained, too many modern alterations have occurred to recommend it eligible to the NRHP.

German/Trinity Lutheran Church

As has been pointed out, this church is well outside the study area. The church itself has been re-sided, and has an addition on the front and one on the rear. These additional and alterations impact the integrity of the structure. Generally, religious properties are considered ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Exceptions to this include those properties that derive significance from architectural or artistic distinction. This church does not appear to be architecturally or artistically distinctive. According to information provided by the Trust, "the historic church was founded by pioneers of Lancaster County in April 1880 as the German Evangelical Lutheran Church of Stockton Precinct...The original church, completed in 1883, later burned. However, the current church building was dedicated in 1917" (letter dated 11/2/99). The fact that there was an earlier church plays no bearing on eligibility. A structure can only be eligible for significance obtained after its construction date (NR Bulletin #15, p. 28). So inferring that this building is significant because of some connection with early pioneers of Lancaster County and an 1883 building that no longer exists is irrelevant. National Register Bulletin #15 points out that "A religious property cannot be eligible simply because [it] was the place of religious services for